

## REMARKS

In the Office Action of May 14, 2008, claims 1-10 were provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-24 of copending U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2005/0110755 A1. In addition, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because the limitation “*said support sub-assembly*” in line 12 of claim 1 has insufficient antecedent basis.

In response to the Section 112, second paragraph, rejection, Applicants have amended the independent claim 1, replacing the limitation “*said support sub-assembly*” with “*said puck sub-assembly*.” As such, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn. Applicants note herein that the independent claim 1 and the dependent claim 3 were also amended to correct minor informalities.

In response to the Section 101 rejections, Applicants respectfully submit that the current pending claims 1-5 and 7-10 of this application are not coextensive in scope with the allowed claims 31-44 of copending U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2005/0110755 A1 (claims 1-24 have been canceled). As such, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Harley et al.

Date: August 3, 2008

By: /thomas h. ham/  
Thomas H. Ham  
Registration No. 43,654  
Telephone: (925) 249-1300